UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/023,597	12/18/2001	Muralidhara Padigaru	21402-224AD (CURA-524AD)	2896

7590 08/18/2004

Ivor R. Elrifi
Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris,
Glovsky and Popeo, P.C.
One Financial Center
Boston, MA 02111

EXAMINER	
LOCKARD, JON MCCLELLAND	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
1647	

DATE MAILED: 08/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

8/4.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/023,597	PADIGARU ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jon M Lockard	1647	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-52 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☒ Claim(s) 1-52 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1-4, 38, 41, drawn to polypeptides, classified in class 530, subclass 350.

II. Claims 5-14, 39, and 42, drawn to nucleic acids, vectors, and host, classified in class 536, subclass 23.5, class 435, subclasses 320.1 and 252.3, for example.

III. Claims 15-17, 40, and 43, drawn to antibodies, classified in class 530, subclass 388.22, for example.

IV. Claims 18 and 44-45, drawn to methods for determining the presence of a polypeptide, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1, for example.

V. Claims 19-21 and 46-47, drawn to methods for determining the presence of a nucleic acid, classified in class 436, subclass 6, for example.

VI. Claims 22-23, 24 (in part), and 50-52, drawn to methods for identifying an agent that binds to a polypeptide, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1, for example.

VII. Claim 24 (in part), drawn to methods for identifying an agent that modulates the expression of a polypeptide, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1, for example.

VIII. Claim 25, drawn to method for modulating the activity of a polypeptide, classification dependent upon compound structure.

IX. Claims 26-29 and 48, drawn to methods of treating or preventing a GPCRX-associated disorder comprising administering a polypeptide, classified in class 514, subclass 2.

X. Claims 30-33, drawn to methods of treating or preventing a GPCRX-associated disorder comprising administering a nucleic acid, classified in class 514, subclass 44, for example.

XI. Claims 34-37 and 49, drawn to methods of treating or preventing a GPCRX-associated disorder comprising administering an antibody, classified in class 514, subclass 2, for example.

2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Each of inventions I, II and III are unrelated to each other. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the polynucleotides, polypeptides, and antibodies are all physically and functionally distinct chemical entities that have different structures, activities, and functions.

3. Invention I and each of IV, VI, VIII, and IX are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product, or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the polypeptide of Invention I can be used to make the antibody of Invention III, in the methods of identifying compounds that bind to it or modulate its activity, or in a method of administration, which are all materially different methods.

4. Invention I and each of V, VII, X, and XI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04 and 808.01). In the instant case the different Inventions of I and each of V, VII, X, and XI are unrelated product and methods, wherein each is not required, one for another. For example, the claimed Inventions V, VII, X, and XI do not require the use of the polypeptide of Invention I.

5. Invention II and each of Inventions V, VII, and X are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product, or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the polynucleotides of Invention II can be used in a method of detecting a nucleic acid, in methods of modulating nucleic acid expression, or in a method of treatment, which are all materially different methods.

6. Invention II and each of IV, VI, VIII, IX, and XI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04 and 808.01). In the instant case the different Inventions of II and each of IV, VI, VIII, IX, and XI are unrelated product and methods, wherein each is not required, one for another. For example, the claimed Inventions IV, VI, VIII, IX, and XI do not require the use of the polynucleotides of Invention II.

7. Invention III and each of IV, VI, VIII, and XI are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different

product, or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the antibody of Invention III can be used to detect the presence of the polypeptide of Invention IV or identify a compound which binds to the polypeptide of Invention VI, but the antibody can also be used in the method of modulating polypeptide activity of Invention VIII, in the method of treatment of Invention XI, or in a method of purifying the polypeptide, which are materially different methods.

8. Invention III and each of V, VII, IX, and X are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04 and 808.01). In the instant case the different Inventions of III and each of V, VII, IX, and X are unrelated product and methods, wherein each is not required, one for another. For example, the claimed Inventions V, VII, IX, and X do not require the use of the antibody of Invention III.

9. The various methods of Inventions IV-XI are drawn to patentably distinct methods. Although there are no provisions under the section for "Relationship of Inventions" in MPEP § 806.05 for Inventions that are directed to different methods, restriction is deemed to be proper because these methods appear to constitute patentable distinct inventions for the following reasons: Inventions IV-XI are directed to methods that are distinct both physically and functionally, have different method steps, starting compounds, and goals, and are not required one for the other.

10. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, recognized divergent subject

matter, and/or separate search requirement, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Further Restriction Within Inventions I-XI

11. Whichever Invention is elected, further restriction within the elected Invention is required to one of the following groups:

> One (1) polypeptide according to SEQ ID NO: 2-128 and a single (1) corresponding polynucleotide (SEQ ID NO:1-127) that encodes it.

12. Although the classifications for the nucleic acids, proteins, and antibodies are overlapping, each represents a patentably distinct product, having different sequences, encoding different proteins, and requiring separate searches. Furthermore, the methods of using the nucleic acids, proteins, and antibodies are also therefore patentably distinct.

13. **Applicants are advised that this is not a species election.**

14. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR

1.312.

15. In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**

16. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

17. A telephone call was made to Christina Stock on 16 August 2004 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

18. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

19. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Jon M. Lockard, Ph.D.** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-2717**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00 AM to 6:00 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Brenda Brumback, Ph.D.** can be reached on **(571) 272-0961**.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **703-872-9306**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see **http://pair-direct.uspto.gov**. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at **866-217-9197** (toll-free).

Eileen B. O'Hara

JML
August 17, 2004

EILEEN B. O'HARA
PATENT EXAMINER